



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,327	04/19/2004	Jimmy Wayne Scott JR.		9577

7590 06/07/2006
Jimmy W. Scott Jr.
2224 E. BARTLEFF PL
CHANDLER, AZ 85249

EXAMINER

LARSON, JUSTIN MATTHEW

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3727

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

1. An examination of this application reveals that applicant is unfamiliar with patent prosecution procedure. While an inventor may prosecute the application, lack of skill in this field usually acts as a liability in affording the maximum protection for the invention disclosed. Applicant is advised to secure the services of a registered patent attorney or agent to prosecute the application, since the value of a patent is largely dependent upon skilled preparation and prosecution. The Office cannot aid in selecting an attorney or agent.

A listing of registered patent attorneys and agents is available on the USPTO Internet web site <http://www.uspto.gov> in the Site Index under "Attorney and Agent Roster." Applicants may also obtain a list of registered patent attorneys and agents located in their area by writing to the Mail Stop OED, Director of the U. S. Patent and Trademark Office, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to because no figure numbers are present. For example, each of the side, bottom, top, front, and back views should be labeled as an individual Figure 1, Figure 2, etc. The descriptive words such as "side", "bottom", "top", "front", and "back" should be mentioned in the specification, not shown in the drawings themselves. The same goes for the words "hem edge", "elastic", "divot", etc. All of these should be referenced in the specification by reference characters.

Art Unit: 3727

3. The drawings are further objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include any reference characters that link the structure shown in the drawings to the written specification.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because nowhere are reference characters used to point out the specific structure of the invention as seen in the drawings. Appropriate correction is required. Applicant is advised to review the prior art made of record as indicated on the attached "Notice of References Cited" and note how the specifications

Art Unit: 3727

and drawings of these patents go hand in hand to demonstrate the structural features of the inventions.

5. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. Claim 1 is rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. The claim(s) must be in one sentence form only. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Previdi (US 2,558,382). While it is abundantly unclear as to what applicant is specifically claiming, applicant has mentioned the term “Hip-Slider Golf Pouch” in the claim. This term has been structurally identified in the specification as a pouch that slides onto a belt strip. Previdi discloses a golf accessory pouch that slides onto a belt strip and holds golfing accessory items at a user’s waist for convenient access.

9. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lomas (US 6,769,587 B1). While it is abundantly unclear as to what applicant is specifically claiming, applicant has mentioned the term “Hip-Slider Golf Pouch” in the claim. This term has been structurally identified in the specification as a pouch that slides onto a belt strip. Lomas discloses a golf accessory pouch that slides onto a belt strip and holds golfing accessory items at a user’s waist for convenient access.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mueller (US D332,176) in view of Previdi (US 2,558,382). Mueller discloses a golf accessory pouch with a zippered opening on its top surface, the pouch having a plurality of exterior attachment devices for various golf accessories. Mueller appears to use a waist-strap to secure the pouch to a user instead of belt loops formed on the rear face of the pouch that allow the pouch to slide onto the belt of a user.

Previdi, however, also discloses a golf accessory pouch and teaches that the pouch may be attached to a user's belt via belt loops (28&29) formed on the rear face of the pouch. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the waist strap of Mueller with another well known attachment means such as the belt loops on the rear surface of the pouch, as taught by Previdi, in order to securely attach the golf accessory pouch to a user's waist.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art made of record includes a multitude of holders that retain golfing accessories at the waist of golfers for easy access thereto.

Art Unit: 3727

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin M. Larson whose telephone number is (571) 272-8649. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8am - 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Newhouse can be reached on (571) 272-4544. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JML


NATHAN J. NEWHOUSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Application/Control Number: 10/826,327
Art Unit: 3727

Page 8